

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 32-43 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 7 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 32-38 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Riley (US Patent No. 6685228).

In paragraph 9 on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riley (US Patent No. 6685228).

In paragraph 11 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 32-33 and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In paragraph 13 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 32-33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph for being indefinite and failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but have amended the application to overcome the objections. Claims 32 and 38 have been amended to remove any possible objection under sec 112 first paragraph, without altering the scope of the claim. It is believed that all claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

A new declaration of William Sanford is now provided with additional statements and supporting documentary evidence. This declaration should now be sufficient to support the removal of the Riley reference as a prior art citation.

In view of the amendments and reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Michael B. Lasky at (952) 253-4106.

Respectfully submitted,  
Altera Law Group, LLC  
Customer No. 22865

Date:

8 June 2007

By:           /Michael Lasky/            
Michael B. Lasky  
Reg. No. 29,555  
MBL/jsa